

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-9, and 11-13 are pending. Claim 11 is amended. Support for the amendment to Claim 11 is self-evident. Claims 1, 3, 10, and 14 were canceled in a previous amendment. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 11 was objected to for a minor informality. Claims 2, 4-9, and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Tonkin (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,568, herein "Tonkin").

Regarding the objection to Claim 11 for a minor informality, Claim 11 is amended to incorporate the suggested claim language provided in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to Claim 11 is overcome.

The Amendment to Claim 11 is submitted in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, which permits the entering of Amendments complying with any requirement of form expressly set forth in a previous Office Action or presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal. As this Amendment does not raise new issues requiring further consideration and/or search, Applicant respectfully requests that the present Amendment be entered under 35 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 2, 4-9, and 11-13 as anticipated by Tonkin, that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response.

Independent Claim 2 recites, in part:

a document supervisory client configured to generate print condition settings; and

a document supervisory server configured to control printing based upon a printing request from the document supervisory client in accordance with the print condition settings...

wherein said document supervisory server changes a combination of the print condition settings and sends an

appropriate combination including one set of changed print condition settings to the document supervisory client when determining the print condition settings are inappropriate.

Accordingly, the server **changes** print condition settings and **sends an appropriate combination of print condition settings** to the client. The server changes the settings when the print condition settings are inappropriate.

In contrast, when user defined information is inappropriate in Tonkin, the apparatus described in Tonkin merely displays an **error message** and **allows the user to change the document settings**. Tonkin states:

In step 256, it is determined whether the user defined information is valid. Specifically, this step checks whether a document can be physically created as specified and preferably occurs automatically as a result of combining the document component objects and production component objects, as described above. This step determines, for example, whether the user has specified double-sided printing for a media type which is only capable of single-sided printing (e.g., transparency), whether the user has specified color printing for a media type which can only be printed in black and white (e.g., certain card stocks), whether the user has specified a binding type which can not accommodate the document (e.g., because the document is too thick or too thin), or whether the user has specified printing on a media type which cannot be printed (e.g., vinyl).

In the event that the information is invalid, an error message is displayed in step 258, preferably indicating the nature of the error, and then processing proceeds to step 254 to allow the user to revise the document specification. If the document specification is valid, processing proceeds to step 260.¹

Accordingly, instead of changing a combination of print condition settings, the system described in Tonkin displays an error message and requests the user to revise the document settings. Nowhere in Tonkin does a server change a combination of print condition settings and send the changed combination to a client as recited in independent Claim 2.

¹ Tonkin, col. 10, lines 23-43 (emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 2 is overcome for at least the reasons discussed above.

Independent Claim 4 recites substantially similar features to those discussed regarding independent Claim 2. Independent Claim 11 recites a method of performing the process for which the system of independent Claim 2 is configured. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 4 and 11 patentably distinguish over Tonkin for at least the same reasons as independent Claim 2.

Claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, and 13 each depend from one of independent Claims 2, 4, and 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 12, and 13 patentably distinguish over Tonkin for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 24,913
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423
Attorney of Record

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

I:\ATTY\LS\21s\217967US\217967US-AM-DUE-6-31-06.DOC